DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 157 673 RC 010 660

AUTHOR Hansen, David O.; And Others
TITLE Rural Sociology in Brazil: Institutional Growth (1965-1977).
PUB DATE 30 Aug 78
NOTE 34p.; Not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility; Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Rural Sociological Society (San Francisco, California, 30 August-3 September 1978)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *College Curriculum; *Cooperation; Cross Cultural Studies; *Graduate Students; *Graduate Study; Professors; *Social Science Research; Teacher Exchange Programs
IDENTIFIERS *Brazil; Graduate Programs; *Rural Sociology

ABSTRACT

Growth and present status of graduate programs, major research interests, and potential for US-Brazilian collaboration indicate the present state of rural sociology in Brazil. In contrast to US rural sociology's identity crisis of the past decade, the field in Brazil has blossomed. Graduate programs are underway at universities of Rio Grande do Sul, Sao Paulo-Piracicaba, Vicosa, Brasilia, and Paraiba-Campina Grande, with 45 professionals affiliated with them. Over half of the full-time staff has Ph.D. degrees, and though staff is small now, projections indicate adequate staffing by 1982. More than 70% of students have undergraduate degrees in one of the social sciences--only 6% in agronomy. Of 116 students who entered programs during the previous two cycles, 76 finished required credits, with failure to complete course work due primarily to poor student performance. Curriculum at the five centers is comparable to that of US programs. Most popular areas of rural research for both students and staff have been social organization (description/theory, voluntary associations, stratification, education) and social change (diffusion, technological change, agricultural development). Two types of collaboration between US and Brazilian rural sociologists are possible: personnel interchange and joint research (allowing opportunity to test sociological propositions cross culturally). (RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED157673

Rural Sociology in Brazil: Institutional Growth (1965-1977)*

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

David O. Hansen

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

David O. Hansen, Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology, The Ohio State University

Ivo A. Schneider, Center of Economic Studies and Research, University of Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil

Vicente de Paula Vitor, Department of Agricultural Economics, The Lavras Agricultural College, Brazil

* We are grateful to the Department of University Affairs of the Brazilian Ministry of Education for giving us permission to use the survey data presented in this paper.

Paper presented at the 1978 annual meeting of the Rural Sociological Society, San Francisco, California, 30 August-3 September 1978.

RC 010360

RURAL SOCIOLOGY IN BRAZIL: INSTITUTIONAL GROWTH (1965-1977)

U.S. rural sociology has undergone an identity crisis during the last decade. As rural populations dwindle, and as we are threatened with cut backs in funding for our programs, we have increasingly turned to the problem of defining today's and tomorrow's relationship between our profession and the larger society. This is reflected in themes of recent presidential addresses (Capener, 1975; Warner, 1974; Ford, 1973; Copp, 1972) and other papers presented at annual meetings (ex. Haller, 1974). No one has gone so far as to prophesy a professional doomsday; however, neither has anyone been very optimistic about the future.

In contrast to our situation, Brazilian rural sociology has blossomed forth during the last 15 years. Prior to that time, some teaching and research of rural society did take place, although institutionalized rural sociology was practically unknown (Stavenhagen, 1964). This was typical of most other societies (Larson, 1968). Today, there are 5 graduate programs in rural sociology, and several in sociology that have rural sociology staff members. Most professionals working in them have been recently trained either in the U.S. or by the new programs themselves. The programs were created primarily to prepare professionals to grapple with transitions in rural society brought on by agricultural modernization and urban industrialization and growth. Contrary to the U.S., the profession's zenith in Brazil appears to rest beyond the horizon.

In this paper, an overview will be given of what has trans-

RC010660

pired in Brazilian rural sociology during this period. More specifically, the growth of graduate programs will be traced, their current situation outlined, and major research interests highlighted. From these data, we will then highlight several mutually beneficial points of future collaboration between U.S. and Brazilian programs.

Evolution of Graduate Programs.

Graduate programs were initiated primarily through the encouragement and support of several departments of U.S. land grant universities, and secondarily of the Ford Foundation. In the early 60's, USAID funded institution building agreements were signed between Arizona and the University of Ceará, Purdue and the University of Viçosa, Ohio State and the University of São Paulo, and Wisconsin and the University of Rio Grande do Sul. Although their chief objective was to establish graduate programs in agricultural sciences, agricultural economics and rural sociology were also emphasized. The first rural sociology graduate program was initiated at Rio Grande do Sul (IEPE) in 1965. Shortly thereafter, an M.S. applied social science program that offered a rural sociology option was begun at São Paulo-Piracicaba (ESALQ). The option became a separate program in 1976. And in 1977, another program was begun at Viçosa (VIÇOSA). Prior to that time Viçosa offered M.S. degrees in agricultural economics and extension, and rural sociologists worked in these programs. The University of Brasília (UNB) commenced a fourth program in 1970. It only offers an M.S. degree in sociology; however, its most important option is in rural studies. Whereas the Ford Foundation gave supplementary grants to the other 3 programs, it was a main source

of outside support at Brasília. A fifth program was begun in 1977 at the University of Paraíba-Campina Grande (CCT) under the leadership of the university's young and dynamic president, Lynaldo Cavalcanti. Most of its support has come from the Brazilian government.

The earliest programs were set up jointly by U.S. rural sociologists who were primarily associated with these USAID contracts, and their Brazilian counterparts. Fritz Fliegel, Donald Johnson and James Converse were instrumental in getting the Rio Grande do Sul program underway, while Ken McDermott and Olen Leonard participated in the programs at Viçosa and São Paulo respectively. They helped set up the curriculums, taught in the programs, and helped train the first M.S. students. Also, during this period, a number of local staff were sent off for graduate training in the U.S., England, and Israel. More recently, the programs have hired non-Brazilian Ph.D.'s trained in the U.S. and elsewheres in addition to those trained at the M.S. level by indigenous programs. An outcome of the heavy input by U.S. rural sociologists has been that program structures and research topics and styles are similar to those found in the U.S.

The Programs Today.[1]

Staff - Adequate human resources are a necessary condition for success of the graduate programs. Fortunately, Brazil's cadre of rural sociologists has grown rapidly during the past 15 years. New generations have been trained and have returned to academic and development-related positions in the public sector.[2] Those entering the university community who are not affiliated with programs reviewed in this article will not be considered. Although they do realize professional activities, their contributions to the graduate programs are indirect if at all.

Detailed current and projected staff profiles for each program are presented in summary Table 1. A total of 45 professionals are currently affiliated with them which averages to 9 staff/program. IEPE's program has the greatest number (12) followed by those of the CCT and the UNB. Slightly over half of the total are Ph.D.'s or the Brazilian "Doutor" equivalent.[3] However, these global figures are somewhat misleading since 4 of them are part-time and a large number of the M.S. staff are in the process of completing doctoral degrees.

Table 1

A sounder reading on core staff for each program is found in the same Table under the sub-title "Effective Full-Time Staff." It includes all members currently working in the programs and not pursuing M.S. or Ph.D. degrees. They total 29 or slightly under 6/ program. Over half (58%) of them have their doctoral degree, although they are distributed unevenly across the Centers. The ESALQ and VIÇOSA programs only have 4 permanent staff each, but they all possess a Ph.D. or its equivalent. On the other hand, the CCT program has a total of 10 full-time staff members, but only two with the highest degree. And three of them still have not completed their M.S. theses. This program was staffed quickly, and primarily with young graduates of existing Brazilian M.S. programs. All Ph.D.'s except 1 were trained in the U.S., and 5 are non-Brazilians. Ph.D.'s were earned at Wisconsin, Ohio State, North Carolina, Harvard, Florida and Sussex, England.

Whereas most staff are small and somewhat strapped to meet adequately all the commitments of a graduate program, projections indicate adequate staffing by 1982. They assume there will be no attrition due to retirements or transfers, that staff members currently pursuing or projected to pursue advanced degrees will have them completed, and that staff hiring plans will materialize and include only Ph.D.'s. Clearly, the UNB and IEPE programs are most ambitious, both having projected 13 full-time members by that time. The great majority of them will have their Ph.D. or equivalent. Both have plans to initiate Ph.D. programs within that period. Smallest staffs are those of the ESALQ and VIÇOSA programs, although all of their members have doctoral degrees. Noteworthy is the fact that these programs are joint with programs in agricultural economics, and there is considerable sharing of resources between them and their sister programs. Excluding the CCT program, the projected average is slightly over 10 full-time staff/program, and all programs will have sufficient numbers to manage strong M.S. degree programs.

Students - Students who most recently entered the programs vary considerably in undergraduate training and prior work experiences. Over 70% have undergraduate degrees in one of the social sciences while only 6% have degrees in agronomy. Most of the latter students were enrolled at the ESALQ which is an agricultural college. Interesting is that 3 of the ESALQ's 4 permanent rural sociology staff members also have undergraduate degrees in agronomy. Other students hold degrees in one of the humanities, education, or related fields.

The mix of previous student training varies somewhat by Center. For example, IEPE's program admitted only 25% with social science backgrounds and 75% with prior training in other areas excluding agronomy. Other programs admitted a majority with social science backgrounds. However, the remainder of students in programs at the CCT, ESALQ and VIÇOSA were originally trained as agronomists, whereas the remainder of UNB students were from other areas. In part, these differences reflect differences in program orientation; in part, they also reflect differences in affiliation. The UNB and IEPE programs are administratively separate from agricultural programs, but the former is located in a social science department while the latter is located in a Center affiliated with a college of economics. The CCT, ESALQ and VIÇOSA programs are all housed in departments having close administrative ties with programs in agriculture.

Almost half of the students had no prior work experience and most came directly from undergraduate schools. This mirrors the difficulty which undergraduate social science majors have in finding employment. Of those who had previous employment, most were in teaching and will return to their institutions of origin. The government made holding advanced degrees a prerequisite for career advancement, and this largely explains the influx of university professors to the programs. Others come from the national agricultural extension (11%) and research (5%) networks. Most advanced degree candidates from these networks enter extension and agricultural graduate programs. Those entering rural sociology have an interest in topics related to the diffusion and adoption of agricultural innovations.

Student performance is reflected in Table 2. A total of 116 students entered the programs during the preceding two cycles. Seventy-six (79%) finished required credits. Failure to complete course work was due primarily to poor student performance. Completion ratios vary considerably by Center. For example, all students who entered the ESALQ program finished while the attrition rate of IEPE and UNB was approximately 40%. Variations are due to policy differences concerning the failure of less able students and to differences in student quality.

Table 2

A total of 26 theses were defended during the years represented by these cycles. Assuming the number of students finishing each cycle is invariable, the percentage of students defending theses can be estimated by dividing the number of theses defended by the number of students finishing during the same period. The ratio is quite low, even if underestimated. In a recent survey of Latin American graduate programs in agricultural economics, Pienup (1975:59) noted that any program that fails to graduate at least 50% of the students it enrolls is in serious difficulty. As these programs develop, however, the situation is likely to improve. Low thesis completion rates are due in large part to the fact that staffs are still being trained and lines of research are still being defined and established.[4]

Curriculum - Program content at each of the Centers is roughly comparable to that of U.S. programs. Each requires completion of a minimum number of credits, a minimum number of courses, a minimum GPA and the defense of a thesis or dissertation.

An indication of program breadth and depth is found in Table 3. It contains data on the distribution of minimum course requirements classified by type for each Center and for all programs. All offer at least one course in theory. This area receives greatest emphasis at the ESALQ which offered 3 courses to the last class of students. All other programs offered just one course, except that at VIÇOSA which offered 2. However, VIÇOSA's theory courses are in micro and macroeconomics. This is in keeping with the emphasis VIÇOSA's program gives to interdisciplinary training. Their primary interest is to train professionals for rural development planning and action programs. Undoubtedly, students in the program are introduced to sociological theory in content courses, but to a lesser degree. All programs offer courses in methods and statistics, although the ESALQ program offers no course in statistics as such. Rather, it offers one course in methodology and another in research techniques that touches on the use of non-parametric statistics in hypothesis testing. All programs offer a variety of courses in substantive areas.

Table 3

Percentage distributions provide a comparative overview of the relative emphasis placed on theory, research tools and content. These data in Table 3 point up the lesser emphasis given to theory; only 10% of the courses offered are in this category, and only 7.4% are in sociological theory. Some variation exists among Centers; 25% of the ESALQ program's courses are in this area as opposed to only 5% at the UNB. Percentages based on total required courses in

the curriculums increase somewhat. Formal methods and statistics courses receive greater emphasis. Fully 20% of those offered are in these areas, as are 25% of the required courses. This indicates the importance programs attribute to quantitative research. In all, there are twice as many courses related to data gathering and manipulation as there are to formal theory. Rural sociology content courses are also an obvious major concern since they represent over two thirds of the courses offered. They are less emphasized in the VIÇOSA and UNB programs for which they total only 50% of the required courses.

Programs vary considerably in the amount of flexibility they allow in student choice of courses. The IEPE program requires that students take 15 and they are the same for all. CCT's program requires that they take 13 courses, 9 of which are invariable. UNB's program requires 9, but students may select 5 of them from a set of optional courses. The ESALQ and VIÇOSA programs require their students to take 8 courses. But VIÇOSA's program requires all of its students to take 7 of them, whereas at the ESALQ students are free to choose any 8 from a list of 12. At all Centers, students take courses in theory and methods along with those in rural sociology content, and in this sense parallel U.S. programs. One major dissimilarity is the absence of independent reading and special topics courses. Only the UNB program's curriculum allows for them and they rarely are held. Again, this is probably a consequence of limited staffing at the Centers.

Research.

Most research undertaken at the Centers is represented by stu-

dent theses. Present and future staff research interests are generally aligned with them, although not necessarily so. In this section we will summarize both using the classification scheme used by Stokes and Miller (1975) and earlier by Sewell (1965) in summarizing rural sociological research in the U.S. Aside from being parsimonious, it allows the reader to estimate complementarity of research interests between Brazilian and U.S. rural sociologists.

A total of 45 theses had been defended by the time of the survey. Over half of them (58%) were completed by students of the IEPE program, and the rest by students of the ESALQ (27%) and UNB (15%) programs. Clearly, the most popular areas have been social organization and social change. They reflect concern with documenting rural social structure and process as well as providing contributions to governmental attempts to modernize the agricultural sector. Half of the theses completed on social organization touched on topics of stratification and class structure. Those completed by ESALQ and IEPE students mainly used methodologies and theoretical frameworks generated by research in the U.S., and were based on community studies. Those completed at the UNB followed the European preference for analyzing social classes and class dynamics and centered on peasantry. Several descriptive community studies were defended at the ESALQ and one regional study at the UNB. Others include a study of agricultural cooperatives defended at the ESALQ, and 2 of rural labor unions and one on rural education completed at IEPE.

Table 4

The introduction of new agricultural technologies to rural areas and changes in agricultural production systems have also been popular topics. Under these rubrics, diffusion and adoption studies have been most common (Andreotti and Rocha, 1974). At least two authors feel they merit special attention by Brazilian rural sociologists (McDermott, 1966; Pastore, 1973). Four theses listed under this heading focused on agricultural communication in the diffusion of innovations, and all were completed at IEPE.[5] Other studies at the ESALQ and IEPE have dealt with adoption of new technologies and efficiency of farm production methods. A thesis on adoption was also defended at the UNB as was one dealing with the broader theme of agricultural modernization.

Eighteen theses on other topics were defended. Several were demographic studies at the ESALQ and IEPE.[6] Except for two theses defended at the ESALQ, others were defended by students of IEPE's program on social psychological and social welfare and policy topics. The 4 theses on aspirations all dealt with education and attitudinal theses were concerned with farmer's perceptions of opportunity structures. Other theses dealt with rural manpower development, level of living and low income farming.

To sum up student research, topics parallel those of interest to U.S. rural sociologists during the 1960's and early 1970's. Many theses were based on data collected by U.S. rural sociologists in Brazil. It is probable that staff interests are also similar since most received advanced training in the U.S. rural sociology programs.

A sounder reading on this is found in Table 5 which shows the major areas of research interest of staff members at each of the Cen-

ters. As was true for theses, most interest exists in researching social organization and social change. On the surface, UNB staff appear to have less diversified interests, but this is due to the small number identifying with the rural studies option. Other research is being conducted at the Center, but either by non-sociologists or on non-rural topics.

Table 5

Staff at the CCT demonstrate greatest interest in topics related to social organization. This is primarily due to two factors. First, we have noted that 5 of its staff are social anthropologists whose main concern is to describe social structure and institutions in the Northeast. Social organization is a traditional research emphasis in social anthropology. Second, most staff members are not from the Northeast and wish to familiarize themselves with local forms of social organization through their research. Other topics of interest are related to social change and migration. Several joint projects with agricultural economists are underway in which rural sociologists are investigating sociological aspects of farm modernization. Migration interests include tracing flows of migrants from the Northeast to industrial poles of the South and back to their places of origin.

ESALQ's staff members have varied research interests. Some research has been done on rural institutions, particularly social stratification and land tenure. This included attempts to type farm enterprises according to their modes of production and relationships to the marketplace. Other topics of continuing interest

include the modernization of agriculture and consequent changes in labor relations and labor mobility. Other staff have continuing interests in the migration of rural populations to agricultural frontiers, and in documenting fertility and mortality trends in rural areas. Research interests related to social welfare and policy include health and nutrition, and the study of low income groups in agriculture.

IEPE's staff has a tradition of conducting studies based on samples drawn from rural counties. Much of this research has centered on describing populations within them. Research of this nature is likely to be done in the future. Other on-going interests related to rural social organization include the study of farm and rural labor syndicates and social stratification. The latter includes studies of status attainment processes in southern Brazil. Other areas of continuing interest are diffusion, adoption and the roles of traditional communication channels such as the local extension system, the radio and newspapers in these processes. Several staff members are also committed to studying organized colonization efforts by the government, and community development projects. Related to these latter topics is a commitment to study rural-rural migration trends, particularly of southern farmers into the frontier territories of the West and North. A final topic of concern is farm labor and manpower training. These interests are expressed in joint research projects with agricultural economists of the Center.

The UNB rural sociologists have strong interests in researching socioeconomic change in rural areas. This has been and will continue to be manifest through studies of rural markets, technology transfers to the farm sector, and critical analyses of governmental

programs designed to promote rural modernization and increase agricultural production. Also related to this topic are interests in documenting transformations of the agrarian structure and migration patterns resulting from them.[7]

We mentioned earlier that VIÇOSA's program was designed to train professionals to work in agricultural development programs. Staff research interests are compatible with this orientation, most relating either to rural development or to social welfare and policy. Deviations from this perspective include the expressed interest of one staff member in researching aspects of rural social organization[8] and of another in documenting migration trends. Although the program was recently initiated, rural sociologists have long worked in the agricultural economics program and have developed interdisciplinary research interests. These have focused on the sociological aspects of agricultural development, with a strong emphasis on diffusion and adoption of new agricultural technologies. Others have and intend to continue to work closely with governmental agencies searching for ways to ameliorate the negative impact of agricultural modernization on rural populations, to incorporate subsistence farmers into this process, and to train the rural labor force in new skills required by changes in agricultural technologies and forms of production.

Diversity of staff research interests at the Centers reflects the multiciplicity of problems meriting attention. These include documenting the national and regional peculiarities of Brazilian rural life, attending to the demands of governmental agencies charged with promoting agricultural development, and documenting the social consequences of rapid rural modernization.

Points of Collaborative Interest.

We have summarized the past and present situation of existing graduate programs in rural sociology, and given some indication of what future staff and research situations will be at their sponsoring Centers. The recent surge in growth as well as the presence of well-trained and highly motivated rural sociologists at them were noted. That the discipline is still largely being consolidated at the Centers is important for it suggests needs for collaborative ventures between Brazilian and U.S. rural sociologists. These ventures may be either between institutions or professionals or at both levels.

As a final section of this paper we explore two types of collaboration, namely, personnel interchange and joint research. Both have occurred to some degree in the past, although primarily through assistance programs. The rapid maturation of Brazilian programs suggests that new types of linkages will need to be identified and used.

Personnel Interchange - Whereas past programs emphasized training of staff members from these Centers, and hence, the importance of U.S. rural sociologists working at them, the presence today of trained and highly capable Brazilian professionals dictates that interaction become less didactic and more colegial in style. Brazilians are best appraised of the most significant problems facing their rural society, and, therefore, best able to define Center priorities in teaching and research. Meaningful dialogue and cooperation require opportunities for constant interaction. It is only through intellectual interchange that problem definition and re-

search results can maximize returns to Brazilian society and to the profession, while at the same time avoiding some of the less inviting characteristics of past collaboration (Portes, 1975:137-140).

Ideally, this interchange would be carried out in Brazil which implies increasing the flow of U.S. professionals to these Centers. Funding sources such as the foundations or perhaps the Brazilian Ministry of Education[9] could be tapped to finance temporary stays by U.S. rural sociologists for periods of from 6 months to 2 years. Individuals interested in acquiring knowledge on facets of Brazilian society might take advantage of sabbaticals or leaves of absence to work at these Centers. Visits could easily germinate more specific comparative interests and collaborative research efforts with Brazilian counterparts. The identification of problems to be investigated would also be more influenced by local concerns and relevancy to Brazilian development which would facilitate obtaining financial backing for them.[10]

Brazilian Centers would benefit from these visits in several ways. First, most need inputs by established professionals to consolidate major lines of research. Interaction within the Centers that results from the presence of visiting professors would greatly facilitate their identification. Initiative would ideally emanate from Center staff, but actual research could be done jointly. A major potential for linkages of this sort now exists between professionals at the Centers and their U.S. major professors and advisors. Centers would also benefit from inputs of new knowledge with respect to research methodologies and techniques. None of

them have professionals working specifically in this research area (see Table 5) which implies that inputs need to come from the outside. Finally, most programs would benefit from contributions by visiting professors as guest lecturers or seminar leaders. The need for these inputs will continue until sufficient numbers of Brazilians are trained and hired by the Centers.

Flow of Brazilian professionals to the U.S. will also be of mutual benefit. For U.S. programs, accepting these professionals as advanced students, post-doctoral fellows or visiting professors will provide a means for creating future links with the Centers. The problems and perspectives which they bring with them may spark new lines of U.S. research as well as substantive comparative studies. Finally, their presence implies a more diversified intellectual environment for U.S. graduate programs, and may open new research and employment opportunities for U.S. graduate students. Brazilian Centers would benefit from the continued training at the Ph.D. and post-doctoral level that is needed to enhance the quality of their graduate programs. Eventually, this interchange might only take the form of visiting professorships.[11]

A second specific form of collaboration is through joint research projects. For U.S. professionals, projects of this nature provide opportunities to test sociological propositions cross-culturally. Those interested in development issues would gain access to the laboratory for rural sociological research represented by Brazil's rapidly changing rural sectors (Rios, 1972:195). Through collaborative projects, U.S. scientists would gain access to the research infrastructure of the Centers. Depending on the ac-

tive involvement of the Brazilian counterparts, results of this research can be diffused in Brazilian society to maximize contributions to development efforts, as well as to provide opportunities for continued professional development.

It is clear to us that many potential opportunities for mutually beneficial interchanges exist. To realize them will depend on the ingenuity and aggressiveness of both Brazilian and U.S. rural sociologists. Regardless of the amount of future interchange, Brazilian rural sociology has emerged as a recognized profession with a sound institutional base and will continue to grow for the foreseeable future.

Footnotes.

1. Data for each of the Tables in this section are taken from a recent survey (November, 1977) of the graduate programs. It was commissioned by the Brazilian Ministry of Education and the authors were members of the survey team.

2. This is opposed to what Diegues Junior (1962) terms the first generation, or those trained earlier by T. Lynn Smith such as J. V. Freitas Marcondes, José Artur Rios and João Gonçalves de Souza.

3. The "Doutor" requires that candidates complete and defend a thesis, but does not require formal course work.

4. Clearly another factor which helps to account for the low ratio is that many employers still do not give a salary incentive for thesis completion. As demand for professionals with graduate training decreases, this situation will probably change.

5. This no doubt reflects the presence of Lloyd Bostian and John Fett of the University of Wisconsin's Department of Agricultural Journalism at IEPE during the formative stages of that program.

6. A member of IEPE's staff is currently completing a Ph.D. with Glenn Fuguitt at the University of Wisconsin, and ESALQ's program has a staff member that identifies with this area. The UNB program recently hired a demographer with a doctorate from Harvard, so it is also soon likely to have theses defended in this area.

7. Social anthropologists who are not directly associated with the rural studies option have research interests that include the study of subsistence agriculture and Brazilian peasantry.

8. Dr. Edgard Vasconcellos de Barros was the first Brazilian to teach a course in rural sociology in Brazil. He was initially trained

as an anthropologist, and over the years has sought to classify and interpret rural social organization in Minas Gerais, his home state.

9. CAPES, which is an agency of the Ministry of Education that is responsible for improving the quality of higher education, has actively recruited U.S. Ph.D.'s in various fields of science and technology to work in the Brazilian university system.

10. Major funding sources for research such as the Ford Foundation, the Hispanic Foundation, and the Social Science Research Council have increasingly placed more emphasis on comparative research that originates in Latin American countries.

11. An agreement now exists between the University of Florida and the UNB Center which facilitates the interchange of staff and students. Prof. Glaucio Soares is presently at Florida as a visiting professor.

References.

Andreotti, C. M. and F. A. S. Rocha.

1974 "Alguns comentários críticos sobre a sociologia rural no Brasil." Revista de Economia Rural 14 (junho):135-153.

Capener, H. R.

1975 "On a discipline in search of application." Rural Sociology 40 (Winter):398-410.

Copp, J. H.

1972 "Rural sociology and rural development." Rural Sociology 37 (December):515-533.

Diegues Junior, M.

1962 "Nota sobre a sociologia rural no Brasil: aspectos de sua formação, desenvolvimento e estado atual." Sociologia 24 (dezembro):245-258.

Fienup, D. F.

1975 "Graduate training and research in agricultural economics in Latin America: a review of the role and performance of eight graduate programs." Pp. 48-71 in L. P. Schertz, A. R. Stephenson and A. M. Weisblat (eds.) International Training in Agricultural Economic Development. New York: ADC.

Ford, T. R.

1973 "Toward meeting the social responsibilities of rural sociology." Rural Sociology 38 (Winter):272-290.

Haller, A. O.

1974 "The prospects for rural sociology." Paper presented at the Annual Meetings of the Rural Sociological Society, Montreal, Canada, August.

Larson, O.

1968 "Rural society." Pp. 580-588 in D. Sills, (ed.) International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences. New York: MacMillan.

McDermott, J. K.

1966 "Pesquisas em sociologia rural necessárias para o desenvolvimento economico." Pp. 219-225 in Anais da IV Reunião da Sociedade Brasileira de Economistas Rurais. São Paulo: SOBER.

Pastore, J.

1973 "O papel do sociólogo rural no desenvolvimento economico da América Latina." Extensão Rural 8 (janeiro):18-21.

Portes, A.

1975 "Trends in international research cooperation: the Latin American case." The American Sociologist 10 (August):131-140.

Rios, J. A.

1972 A Sociologia Rural No Brasil: Sua Evolução, Principais Problemas e Situação Atual. Brasília: Ministério Agricultura.

Sewell, W. H.

1965 "Rural sociological research, 1936-1965." Rural Sociology 30 (December):428-451.

Stavenhagen, R.

1964 "Rural sociological research in Brazil." Rural Sociology 29 (Fall):231-246.

Stokes, C. S. and M. K. Miller.

1975 "A methodological review of research in rural sociology since 1965." Rural Sociology 40 (Winter):411-434.

Warner, K.

1974 "Rural society in a post-industrial age." Rural Sociology 39 (Winter):306-318.

Table 1: Actual and Projected (1982) Staff Profiles of Rural Sociology Programs.

Graduate Programs	Actual Total Staff					Effective Full-Time Staff					Projected Full-Time Staff (1982)				
	PhD	Doc	MS	BS	Total	PhD	Doc	MS	BS	Total	PhD	Doc	MS	BS	Total
UNB	5[j]	1	3[c]	-	9	3	1	1	-	5	11	1	1	-	13
CCT[a]	1	1	5	3	10	1	1	5	3	10	-	-	-	-	-
ESALQ	1[b]	5[e]	1[d]	-	7	-	4	-	-	4	2	4	-	-	6
IEPE	2	3[i]	7[f]	-	12	2	1	3	-	6	10	1	2	-	13
VIÇOSA	4[h]	1	2[g]	-	7	3	1	-	-	4	8	1	-	-	9
Total	13	11	18	3	45	9	8	9	3	29	31	7	3	-	41

a. Includes 5 rural sociologists and 5 social anthropologists; no projections due to newness of program and consequent lack of concrete plans.

b. Includes 1 visiting professor.

c. Includes 2 in Ph.D. training (1 in England and 1 in São Paulo.

d. Includes 1 visiting professor loaned by State Extension Service.

e. Includes 1 part-time "Doutor."

f. Includes 2 in U.S. for Ph.D. training and 2 ABD's in residence.

g. Includes 1 in U.S. for Ph.D. training and 1 ABD in residence.

h. Includes 1 part-time Ph.D. in education.

i. Includes 2 part-time "Doutores."

j. Includes 1 visiting professor and 1 currently on leave.

Table 2: Number of Students Matriculated, Finishing Credits and Defending Theses.

Graduate Center	Matriculated	Finishing Courses	Defending Theses[a]	% Finishing Credits	% Defending Theses[c]
UNB.....	35	22	9	63	41
-Last Class (77)	18	10	5	56	50
-Penultimate Class (76)	17	12	4	71	33
CCT[b].....	10	--	--	--	--
-Last Class (77)	10	--	--	--	--
-Penultimate Class	--	--	--	--	--
ESALQ.....	39	39	12	100	31
-Last Class (76/77)	17	17	5	100	29
-Penultimate Class (74/75)	22	22	7	100	32
IEPE.....	22	13	5	59	38
-Last Class (77)	12	6	3	50	33
-Penultimate Class (76)	10	7	2	70	43
VIÇOSA[b].....	10	--	--	--	--
-Last Class	10	--	--	--	--
-Penultimate Class	--	--	--	--	--
Total	116	76	26	79	34

a. Figures represent theses defended that year by previous classes; for ESALQ they represent 73/74 and 75/76 since new classes admitted every two years.

b. First class had still not completed cycle at time of survey.

c. Estimated by dividing number of theses defended during last two periods by the number finishing credits during these periods.

Table 3: Curriculum and Minimum Course Work Requirements by Center.

Graduate Center	Theory				Methods and Statistics				Rural Sociology and Others[d]				Total			
	Offered		Required		Offered		Required		Offered		Required		Offered		Required	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
CCT	1	6	1	11	3	17	2	22	14	77	6	67	18	100	9	100
ESALQ[a]	3	25	-	--	2	17	-	--	7	58	2	100	12	100	2	100
IEPE	1	7	1	7	3	21	3	21	10	72	10	72	14	100	14	100
VIÇOSA	2[b]	13	2	20	3	20	3	30	10	67	5	50	15	100	10	100
UNB[c]	1	5	1	17	5	23	2	33	13	68	4	57	19	100	7	100
Total	8	10	5	12	16	20	10	25	54	67	27	64	81	100	42	100

a. Students may take optional courses at other University of São Paulo campuses.

b. Both courses in economic theory.

c. Refers only to rural studies option in sociology program.

d. Includes required courses in Brazilian problems and seminars.

Table 4: Topics of Theses Defended in M.S. Programs by Center.

Topics	ESALQ No.	ESALQ %	IEPE No.	IEPE %	UNB[a] No.	UNB[a] %	Total No.	Total %
Social Organization.....	5	35.7	6	23.1	3	60.0	14	31.6
- Description and Theory	2	14.3	-	----	1	20.0	3	6.7
- Voluntary Associations	1	7.1	2	7.7	-	----	3	6.7
- Stratification (& classes)	2	14.3	3	11.5	2	40.0	7	15.6
- Education	-	----	1	3.9	-	----	1	2.2
Social Change.....	4	28.6	7	27.0	2	40.0	13	28.9
- Technological Change	3	21.5	3	11.6	1	20.0	7	15.6
- Diffusion (& Communications)	1	7.1	4	15.4	-	----	5	11.1
- Agricultural Development	-	----	-	----	1	20.0	1	2.2
Social Psychology.....	1	7.1	5	19.2	-	----	6	13.3
- Attitudes	-	----	2	7.7	-	----	2	4.4
- Aspirations	1	7.1	3	11.5	-	----	4	8.9
Population.....	3	21.5	3	11.5	-	----	6	13.3
- Fertility and Mortality	2	14.3	1	3.8	-	----	3	6.7
- Migration	1	7.2	2	7.7	-	----	3	6.7
Social Welfare and Policy.....	1	7.1	5	19.2	-	----	6	13.3
- Farm Labor	1	7.1	1	3.8	-	----	2	4.4
- Housing and Level of Living	-	----	3	11.6	-	----	3	6.7
- Poverty	-	----	1	3.8	-	----	1	2.2
Total	14		26		5		45	

a. Only includes those related to rural phenomena.

Table 5: Principal Topics of Research Interest to Staff Members of Graduate Program Centers.

Topics	CCT	ESALQ	IEPE	UNB[a]	VIÇOSA	Total
Social Organization.....						10
- Description and Theory	X		X		X	3
- Voluntary Associations	X		X			2
- Stratification	X	X	X			3
- Land Tenure	X	X				2
Social Change.....						10
- Description and Theory		X				1
- Technological Change		X		X		2
- Diffusion (& Communications)	X		X		X	3
- Agricultural Development	X			X	X	3
- Community Development			X			1
Population.....						6
- Fertility and Mortality		X		X		2
- Migration	X	X	X		X	4
Social Welfare and Policy.....						5
- Health		X				1
- Poverty		X			X	2
- Farm Labor			X		X	2

a. Only includes staff members associated with rural sociology option.